

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of September 11, 2013

Members Present: Capi Wampler, Brendan Ross, Nan Chase, Jo Stephenson, Brian Cook, Patricia Cothran, J. Ray Elingburg, David Carpenter, Woodard Farmer, David Nutter

Members Absent: Tracey Rizzo, Sue G. Russell

Staff: Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner, Jannice Ashley

Public: Glenn Stach, Jeremy McCowan, Steve Sreb, David Schweizer, Andrew Willett, Andrew Gardner, Diana Bellgowan, Michael McDonough, Kevin Ward, Joseph Kitt, Kevin Kerr, Rebecca Banne

Call to Order: Chair Wampler calls the meeting to order at 4:02 pm with a quorum present.

Adoption of Minutes: Peggy Gardner submits changes to vote record on p. 14.
Commissioner Nutter asks that a sentence be removed on p.14.

Commissioner Nutter moves to adopt the August 14, 2013 minutes with changes as noted.
Second by: Commissioner Carpenter
Vote for: ALL

Consent Agenda:

Commissioners Farmer and Carpenter present observations from their site review of 152 Montford Avenue concerning the extent of shingles on the rear elevation. Commissioner Cothran asks for this item to be taken off the Consent Agenda.

Motion by: Commissioner Cothran
Second by: Commissioner Chase
Vote for: ALL

1. Owner/Applicant: Kevin and Hani Palme
Subject Property 183 Pearson Drive
Hearing Date: September 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9639.94-5041
Zoning District: RM-8

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – specifications for door and windows; Exhibit C – eight photographs of existing structure; Exhibit D – site plan; Exhibit E – main floor demolition plan; Exhibit F – main, second and

HRC Minutes
September 11, 2013

third floor plans; Exhibit G – existing front (south), rear (north), side (west) and side (east) elevations; Exhibit H – proposed front (south), rear (north), and side (east) elevations; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28th day of August, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 28th day of August, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits I and J.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to renovate structure per attached approved plans and specifications. Work to include the following: Remove existing front porch infill, side stair and brick. Reframe porch floor and stair. Repair pebbledash and exposed porch columns to match original. Remove window on east side rear elevation, lower level and infill with shake siding to match wall. Remove non-original window in rear and replace with three double hung wood windows. Remove existing storm windows in the rear upper level sleeping porch and install double hung replacement windows in existing openings. Remove rear fixed glass panel window in gable and replace with (3) nine over one SDL, double- hung wood windows. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Porches Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The porch will be restored more in keeping with its original configuration.
 - b. The changes to the windows and doors are confined to the rear and non character defining elevations.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Ross
Second by: Commissioner Chase
Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Ross
Second by: Commissioner Chase
Vote for: ALL

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Michael McDonough
Subject Property: 152 Montford Ave.
Hearing Date: September 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.12-0436
Zoning District: RM-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten submits a photograph of a stone wall typical of the district that is no higher than 24". She reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description from National Register nomination: (Pentecostal Tabernacle) Late 19th early 20th century temple form structure, formerly a grocery, with false front. Altered. Before 1907 (S)</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Rehabilitate property for residential and commercial use per attached plans and specifications. Work will include the following items. 1) Remove metal flue and brick chimney. 2) South elevation: remove metal door, stair and landings. Cut opening and install new (insert specs) door. 3) West/rear elevation: cut and install new aluminum clad, full light entrance door. Install new pair of full light aluminum clad doors on 2nd level. Construct 6' x 10' entry porch with balcony above suspended by 3" metal plate bracketed posts; porch and balcony will have metal posts with horizontal cable railings; enclose porch sides with vertical wood fencing. 4) North/side elevation: remove basement level door and infill retaining walls. 5) Front elevation: remove metal siding and install wood shingles Increase overhang on parapet roof 2"; add trim below and metal cap on top. Install new trim around windows. Install zinc alloy metal roof on metal purlins supported by curved metal brackets. Install new full light glass door with narrow metal style rails. Install new thin metal handrails. 6) North side elevation: Remove non-historic door and replace with wood and glass door. Replace non historic windows with (insert specs) 7) Restore all original wood windows, trim, siding and masonry as necessary.8) Site work includes excavating earth to reveal full basement level and construct a brick patio on the north side. Create 2 parking spaces on W. Chestnut St. and relocate the sidewalk; construct stone wall not to exceed 18" in height adjacent to north side patio and stone wall on south side 24" high with metal gate. Replace sloped concrete slab in front of building with brick steps and sidewalk. Remove asphalt and install new street trees, buffer plantings and foundation plantings. Construct 72" high wooden fence to conceal mechanical equipment on south side of structure. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Doors specifications should be submitted to staff2. Stone wall should not exceed 24" in height
-----------------------	--

	<p>The Secretary of Interior Standards found on page 29, the guidelines for Chimneys found on pages 58-59, the guidelines for Wood found on pages 66-67, the guidelines for Masonry and Stucco found on pages 64-65, the guidelines for Porches Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, the guidelines for Accessibility and Life Safety Modifications found on pages 54-55, Sidewalks Streets & Public Infrastructure found on pages 46-47, and the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure will be rehabilitated for a new use that is compatible with its historic character.
Applicant(s)	Michael McDonough, property owner, offers to answer questions.

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Carpenter shows photographs of the rear gable that he says show evidence the shingles extended to a lower point. Mr. McDonough says he is open to extending the shingles. He wonders why the siding comes up to where the rafters were plated, and says he would like the line of the shingles to remain flexible until evidence is uncovered that shows the correct positioning.

Commissioner Cothran asks if the applicant has considered cutting out a small piece of lumber adjacent to the front door to determine evidence of original materials. Commissioner Carpenter says the sheathing is exposed in the that area and other test areas, Mr. McDonough agrees. They comment on the problem of uncovering asbestos.

Commissioner Carpenter says he would like to see the horizontal siding continue to the front to match the sides of the building. Mr. McDonough says there has not been evidence of horizontal siding revealed on the front facade. He thinks continuing siding to the front to match the sides would not have good proportions at that line. He says the earliest photograph they have found of the building from the 1960s shows asbestos shingles on the front from top to bottom. He says they would like to proceed with shingles over the entire front, unless photographic evidence of an earlier treatment emerges.

Chair Wampler suggests the discussion conclude, noting there is no evidence of siding on the front facade. Ms. Merten says the project is seeking tax credits and will be reviewed by the SHPO.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – hardscape site plan; Exhibit B – landscape site plan; Exhibit C – main level floor plan; Exhibit D – photograph of existing southwest and southeast elevations; Exhibit E – two pages of sketches of proposed changes

superimposed on photograph of southwest and southeast elevations; Exhibit F – photograph of existing northeast and northwest elevations; Exhibit G – two pages of sketches of proposed changes superimposed on photograph of northeast and northwest elevations; (*Exhibits H – N submitted 8/14/13*) Exhibit H – zinc awning sample; Exhibit I – two drawings showing gate and railing details; Exhibit J – upper level floor plan; Exhibit K – brick sample; Exhibit L – stone sample; Exhibit M – photograph of building c. 1960; Exhibit N – three photographs showing existing front entrance, fire escape and basement door; Exhibit O – revised drawing of front façade (*submitted 8/21/13*); Exhibit P – photograph showing stone wall example (*submitted 9/11/13*); Exhibit Q – two photographs of rear gable (*submitted 9/11/13*); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 31st day of July, 2013 and on the 28th day of August, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31st day of July, 2013 and on the 28th day of August, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits R, S and T, U.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to Rehabilitate property for residential and commercial use per attached plans and specifications. Work will include the following items. 1) Remove metal flue and brick chimney. 2) South elevation: remove metal door, stair and landings. 3) West/rear elevation: cut and install new aluminum clad, full light entrance door. Install new pair of full light aluminum clad doors on 2nd level. Construct 6’ x 10’ entry porch with balcony above suspended by 3” metal plate bracketed posts; porch and balcony will have metal posts with horizontal cable railings; enclose porch sides with vertical wood fencing. 4) North/side elevation: remove basement level door and infill retaining walls. 5) Front elevation: remove metal siding and install wood shingles Increase overhang on parapet roof 2”; add trim below and metal cap on top. Install new trim around windows. Install zinc alloy metal roof on metal purlins supported by curved metal brackets. Install new full light glass door with narrow metal style rails. Install new thin metal handrails. 6) North side elevation: Remove non-historic door and replace with wood and glass door. 7) Restore all original wood windows, trim, siding and masonry as necessary. 8) Site work includes excavating earth to reveal full basement level and construct a brick patio on the north side. Create 2 parking spaces on W. Chestnut St. and relocate the sidewalk; construct stone wall not to exceed 18” in height adjacent to north side patio and stone wall on south side 24” high with metal gate. Replace sloped concrete slab in front of building with brick steps and sidewalk. Remove asphalt and install new street trees, buffer plantings and foundation plantings. Construct 72” high wooden fence to conceal mechanical equipment on south side of structure. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That The Secretary of Interior Standards found on page 29, the guidelines for Chimneys found on pages 58-59, the guidelines for Wood found on pages 66-67, the guidelines for Masonry and Stucco found on pages 64-65, the guidelines for Porches Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, the guidelines for Accessibility and Life Safety Modifications found on pages 54-55, Sidewalks Streets & Public Infrastructure found on pages 46-47, and the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

- a. The structure will be rehabilitated for a new use that is compatible with its historic character.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Ross

Vote for: Commissioners Wampler, Ross, Chase, Stephenson, Cook, Elingburg, Farmer, and Nutter

Vote against: None

Abstained: Commissioners Cothran and Carpenter

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

With the following conditions:

- 1. Revised drawing of rear elevation showing shingle extension be submitted for staff review.**
- 2. Door specifications be submitted for staff review.**

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Chase

Vote for: Commissioners Wampler, Ross, Chase, Stephenson, Cook, Elingburg, Farmer, and Nutter

Vote against: None

Abstained: Commissioners Cothran and Carpenter

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Kate Dilworth
Subject Property: 101 Cumberland Ave.
Hearing Date: September 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.12-04-9601
Zoning District: RM-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report. She notes the Commission needs to address whether the north elevation is a character-defining facade, and its visibility.</p> <p>Property Description: MacKenzie House. Early 20th century 2-story irregularly shaped vernacular stucco dwelling. Wide porch with Montford brackets, possibly designed by R. S. Smith. Before 1907.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Add new one over one wood window on 2nd level of north elevation between existing windows and new window on</p>
-----------------------	--

	<p>addition approved at August, 2013, meeting. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New window openings should be installed on non-character defining facades of the building. <p>The guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted.</p> <p>Reasons:</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Andy Gardner, Builtwright Construction, offers to answer questions. He points out previous changes to the structure. He says they have tried to reflect the pattern of the original windows.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioners Nutter and Farmer say from their site visits, they do not think the north facade is visible. Commissioner Ross disagrees, and thinks it will be visible when the leaves are off the trees, and it is a character-defining facade. Commissioner Chase notes previous changes have significantly altered the original structure.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – revised north, south and east elevations (*submitted 9/11/13*); Exhibit B – photograph of side elevation with foliage (*submitted 9/11/13*); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28th day of August, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 28th day of August, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits C and D.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

3. That the application is to add new one over one wood window on 2nd level of north elevation between existing windows and new window on addition approved at August, 2013, meeting. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The addition of the window does not compromise a character defining façade.
 - b. The changes are not easily viewed from the street.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Cook

Vote for: Commissioners Wampler, Chase, Stephenson, Carpenter, Cook, Cothran, Elingburg, Farmer, and Nutter

Vote against: Commissioner Ross

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Cook

Vote for: Commissioners Wampler, Chase, Stephenson, Carpenter, Cook, Cothran, Elingburg, Farmer, and Nutter

Vote against: Commissioner Ross

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Jeanette Syprzak
Subject Property: 41 Starnes Ave.
Hearing Date: September 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.22-8325
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten says this item was split from a previous application and continued. A deck and porch on the rear were approved. She shows photographs of the property, noting doors and windows that do not appear
-----------------------	---

	<p>to be original, and reviews the following staff report. She says the applicant has had another porch addition approved on a different house, but that was on a facade that was not visible.</p> <p>Property Description: Dr. Eugene B. Glenn House. Early 20th century 2½ story vernacular Queen Anne dwelling. Turned porch posts, sawn ornament, multiple gables, asbestos siding. 1906-1907 (D)</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new 10 x 16 ft. screened side porch on west side of house with shed style roof. Porch posts will be turned to compliment front porch posts with 36” high balustrade and pickets 4” on center to match front porch. Porch flooring will be T&G with ceiling open to rafters above. Roof material and paint will match existing house. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Skylights should not be visible from a primary right of way2. Investigate age of existing door and far left window opening3. New window & door openings should be installed on non-character defining facades of the building. <p>The guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, Windows & Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval provided concerns are addressed.</p> <p>Reasons: <i>(to be determined by Commission)</i></p> <p>Commissioner Chase asks if the roof will obscure the existing windows (yes). Commissioner Carpenter asks if the skylights would be visible (yes), and if the gable will be closed. Ms. Merten says it should be closed, but is undetermined.</p> <p>Commissioners Stephenson notes the importance of determining the character defining features and facade, and Commissioner Ross ask if these were determined at the previous hearing. Ms. Merten says they were discussed. Atty. Ashley asks what the features would be. Ms. Merten and Commissioner Farmer says the matching triple windows on the main floor and the second floor are important defining features, other Commissioners agree. Commissioner Carpenter notes the facade has had previous alterations.</p> <p>Commissioner Nutter asks if a deck has been discussed. Ms. Merten thinks this would be out of character with the district and incongruent with the guidelines. Commissioner Chase asks if the proposed fence would obscure a deck. Ms. Merten says it would not, due to the railings. She thinks a porch would fit the district more than a deck, if anything is added.</p>
--	--

Applicant(s)	<p>Jeremy McGowan, contractor, states he has been asked to speak for the homeowner, but he has only known about the project for one week and is not familiar with what was discussed at the previous meeting about the project. He says the owner has agreed to remove the skylights from the application. He shows a closeup photo of the area, and says they would like to remove the existing door (non-original), and the window nearest it. They would like to put in a door that would fit the window's opening. He shows a sketch of this new configuration. The door would be 30" wide and 7" tall. Commissioner Nutter asks for the dimensions from the corner to that window (approx. 5 ½').</p> <p>Mr. McGowan says the gable end could be closed in with a vertical beadboard to match the front porch. He asks if screening the porch is open to discussion. Commissioner Carpenter says omitting the screening would strengthen the application, because it further obscures the features and is not traditional.</p> <p>Commissioner Chase says the upper trim of the three windows are important, and any roof would obscure this. Commissioner Cook asks if there will be any brackets like those on the front porch (<i>no</i>).</p> <p>Ms. Merten asks Mr. McGowan to clarify the amendments they want to make to the application – close the side gable with material to match the front porch; no skylights; no screening; remove existing door and window; install door in window opening.</p> <p>Commissioner Chase asks if there is an existing landing, could the door and window change be approved? Atty. Ashley says this would have to be requested by the applicant. Ms. Merten notes there would be no harm in doing this. Mr. McGowan says he doesn't think his client would want those changes without the porch approval, he does not ask for the condition.</p> <p><i>(Commissioner Stephenson leaves, 5:07)</i></p> <p>Andrew Weil, architect, points out a hip roof would be more diminutive. If the ceiling line was raised and doesn't engage the trim, the three windows would still be strongly visible from the street.</p>
---------------------	---

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

<p>Commissioner Carpenter says he agrees with Mr. Weil that a double hip roof would diminish the effect, but thinks the three windows will be impacted regardless. Commissioner Chase asks if the application is denied, how long would the applicant have to wait to come back with just the door and window change. Ms. Merten says they could come back immediately.</p>

Commission Action

<p>MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT</p> <p>Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project</p>
--

description; Exhibit B – storyboard; Exhibit C – location map and site plan; Exhibit D – six photographs of property in relation to neighboring BellSouth property; Exhibit E – architectural drawing of proposed side porch addition; Exhibit F – existing photograph of side elevation, renderings of porch addition from side and from street elevation; Exhibit G – drawing of proposed side porch; Exhibit H – photograph of two doors; Exhibit I – photograph of side elevation; Exhibit J – photograph with dimensions of porch column, with detail drawing; Exhibit K – artist’s rendering of proposed addition, showing rear, front, and left elevations; Exhibit L – drawings showing location of new door (*submitted 9/11/13*); Exhibit M – two photographs showing existing trim (*submitted 9/11/13*); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28th day of August, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 28th day of August, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits N and O.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to construct new 10 x 16 ft. unscreened side porch on west side of house with shed style roof. Porch posts will be turned to compliment front porch posts with 36” high balustrade and pickets 4” on center to match front porch. Porch flooring will be T&G with ceiling open to rafters above. Roof material and paint will match existing house. Side gable facing street will be enclosed with beadboard matching front porch. Remove existing non-historic door and place new wood door in non-historic window opening. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, Windows & Doors found on pages 84-85 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does not** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The porch obstructs character defining features, specifically the triple windows on 1st floor.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are not** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Cook

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **denied**.

Motion by: Commissioner Cook Second by: Commissioner Chase Vote for: ALL
--

Mr. McGowan asks for clarification of the ruling to tell his client, could a covered porch be approved on this façade? Chair Wampler answers no, nor will a deck.

(Agenda item 4 Birch Street was withdrawn prior to the meeting)

Commissioner Farmer asks for clarification of the terms used in the revised guidelines, primary, secondary and accessory structures before the next presentation. He asks if there is only one primary structure per lot. Ms. Merten answers no, the term secondary structure is not used in the guidelines. In the revised guidelines there is a distinction made between a primary structure in a prominent location vs. a primary structure located on an alley or behind a main structure.

Commissioner Farmer asks if anything is added to a lot with a house already on it, is anything else built on that lot an accessory to that structure, or can it be a primary structure. Ms. Merten replies the way Zoning treats it is different than the way the HRC treats it. She reads from the recently revised guidelines. Concerning accessory structures: "For the purpose of these guidelines an accessory structure is a subordinate structure which is detached but located on the same lot as the primary structure." Concerning primary structures: "New primary structures located along alleys, behind existing structures or in other locations where the original historic structures were smaller in scale as documented on Sanborn maps or historical photographs, should be smaller in scale in keeping with the historic context, unless reconstructing an historic structure based on accurate documentation."

Ms. Merten notes there have historically been carriage houses or servants quarters smaller in scale tucked in the back of lots. In some recent reviews, the character of the neighborhood has been noted, though there were no guidelines that pertained to the scale. She says in the following reviews, there are some that are zoned multi-family, they could build another equally sized structure under zoning, but the new guidelines require a traditional relationship of scale. A commissioner asks if the lot would have to be subdivided (*no*). Ms. Merten says there could be a smaller primary structure on the same lot, for instance along an alleyway.

Ms. Merten displays the pages of the revised guidelines showing these definitions. She says it is helpful to think of the form, rather than the usage. She says it is clear on the Sanborn maps these structures were smaller in scale. Commissioner Farmer suggests an accessory structure is usually subordinate to the main house, whereas another primary structure is meant to be a separate dwelling. Ms. Merten agrees. She says some of the following preliminary reviews were advertised as new accessory structures, but should be reviewed as new single family residences.

Preliminary Review:

1.

Owner/Applicant: Joseph Kitt
Subject Property 139 Montford Ave.
Hearing Date: September 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.12-2392
Zoning District: RM-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten says this application should be reviewed under the revised guidelines as a new primary structure, not an accessory structure. She notes the lot is large enough to be subdivided, but that is not the plan. She shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: B. C. Gudger House. Early 20th century 1 1/2 story gambrel roof Colonial Revival style dwelling. Shingles in gable end, weatherboarded, Palladian window, stylized Doric posts.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct a new primary structure located along the rear alley, per attached plans and specifications. New structure will be 980 sq. ft. with German siding on lower level and wood shingles above.</p> <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Storyboard, materials samples, and window and door specifications are required for final review. <p>The guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC provide feedback to the applicant.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Kevin Ward, architect, describes the proposal as secondary to the primary structure, and says the materials will be the same as the main house. He says they will share a driveway from the alley. He says there are no plans to ever subdivide the property, even if it could be. His client wants the design to reflect the main house.</p>

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioners ask about the orientation of the house, Mr. Ward says it will face north, perpendicular to the alley. Chair Wampler asks if there is landscaping planned. Mr. Ward answers yes, and say they intend to use plantings to provide privacy between the houses. He says there will be a few steps to the driveway, addressing the grade. Ms. Merten tells him to note the parking areas in his submitted plans. Atty. Ashley reminds him this will be reviewed as a primary structure.

Mr. Ward asks what will be required for a storyboard, since it is not visible from the main road. Commissioners suggest he show the structure in relation to the main house, the alley and any adjoining properties. They discuss the windows on the south and east drawings, and offer suggestions. Ms. Merten suggests casements on the south elevation, and Commissioner Carpenter suggest the staircase window be higher. Mr. Ward thanks them for their input.

2.

Owner/Applicant: Pamela Dupuis/Andrew Willett
Subject Property 19 Soco St.
Hearing Date: September 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649
Zoning District: RS-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten says this is an accessory structure and reviews the following report. She shows a Sanborn map which shows previous accessory structures on the property, one crosses the property line.</p> <p>Property Description: Early 20th century 1 1/2 story vernacular cottage. Low sweeping roof, shingle siding, recessed porch, double dormers. (R. S. Smith architect?) Before 1917 (S)</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct a new accessory structure per attached plans and specifications. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new structure should be located in the original location of the original accessory structure on the lot and oriented in the traditional pattern. Consult Sanborn maps for location. 2. The new structure should have detailing compatible with the main structure or other structures in the district. <p>The guidelines for Carriage Housed Garages and Other Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC provide feedback to the applicant.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Andrew Willett, architect representing Pamela Dupuy, describes his client's wish to use salvaged windows she has acquired from antique shows. There are three original windows from the house they also want to use, he shows a photograph of the rear of the house showing their location. He says they hope to let the cedar shingles go natural, use asphalt roof,</p>

	exposed rafter tails, and paint the window trims to match the house. He shows a site map, and says the proposed location is not visible from any street.
--	--

Commission Comments/Discussion

<p>Chair Wampler asks Mr. Willett why he is not placing the structure on an original accessory site, and asks if there is evidence of foundations. Ms. Merten notes this is a requirement in the revised guidelines, unless there are problems with that site. Mr. Willett says they want to push it back into the corner of the lot as much as possible. He says it could be oriented to match the previous ones.</p> <p>Commissioner Farmer asks about the square footage (<i>approx. 16' x 20', 320 SF</i>). Commissioner Carpenter asks if the horizontal ones could be vertical (<i>yes</i>). Ms. Merten notes there are three different kinds of windows, and they should be more compatible with the house. Mr. Willett indicates budget concerns. Ms. Merten notes they could be one over one, they don't have to be as intricate as the windows on the main house. She says a transomed door is not typical on an accessory structure. Mr. Willett says they will alter their window and door plans to be more compatible. He asks if the siting is appropriate. Ms. Merten says it should be sited on an original location to meet the guidelines, or show why that location is problematic.</p>
--

3.

Owner/Applicant: Steven Sreb
Subject Property 109 Santee Street
Hearing Date: September 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9630.85-6109
Zoning District: RS-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten says two primary structures are contained in this application. She notes the site has a steep slope in the front, and a topographical map would be helpful. She asks the applicant to address this with the storyboard he presents in the final review. She shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel. Previous non-contributing structure was removed.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new primary structure with secondary residence to the rear of the property. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If being built as a new primary structure, it should be differentiated somewhat from the main structure on the lot. 2. Storyboard, materials samples, and window and door specifications are required for final review. <p>The guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93</p>
-----------------------	--

	<p>in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC provide feedback to the applicant.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Steve Sreb describes his plans for a 1400 SF bungalow in the front of the lot, with a 500 SF cottage in the back. He says there is an existing driveway on the lot, with room for two cars to park. He says they plan to use street parking for additional needs.</p>

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Carpenter asks about the cedar shake siding on the larger house, saying it should be the same on all elevations. Mr. Sreb says he can do this. Commissioner Cook says the lattice should be horizontal/vertical, not diagonal. Commissioner Carpenter says this style is now more available. Mr. Sreb introduces David Schweitzer, his project manager, who says this is something they can do.

Commissioner Cook notes there should be continuous base to the foundation under the window bumpout on the small house. Commissioner Farmer asks about the location of parking. Ms. Merten says it should be as far back as possible. Mr. Sreb says he thought street parking was being encouraged. Ms. Merten says this is fine, but if on-site, it should be behind the structures unless there is no access. Mr. Sreb says the existing driveway can be used, or not. Ms. Merten says on-site may be required, but HRC could waive this requirement. She says traditionally driveways went to the rear of the property.

Mr. Sreb shows his landscaping plan, and shows area for two cars to park. He shows the location of a large tree that they want to preserve. Ms. Merten says preserving the tree and greenspace is a valid argument for using the existing parking area. David Schweitzer asks if steps could be installed straight in from the street, and says the driveway could be eliminated. Commissioner Chase notes this could cause practical problems with accessibility, for service trucks or tenant's convenience. Mr. Sreb notes there is no back entrance to the lot.

Ms. Merten directs the applicant to show tree protection means on their submitted plans. Mr. Sreb asks for guidance on the storyboard, mentions re-grading the property to remove some of the difference in levels. Ms. Merten says grading should be minimal to be in keeping with the guidelines. Mr. Sreb says the grading results from the removal of the brick house. She says this should be addressed on the storyboard, Commissioner Cook describes ways to show the elevation changes. Ms. Merten suggests pier construction to help tree preservation. Mr. Sreb says he will keep this in mind, and thanks the Commission for their suggestions.

4.
Owner/Applicant: Set Sail Development
Subject Property 8 Short Street
Hearing Date: September 11, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.21-0374
Zoning District: RM-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows photographs of the property and reviews the following staff report. She notes there was a previous preliminary hearing, and the applicant has moved the parking to the back of the lot as a result of that discussion.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel, where condemned historic structure was removed in early 2013.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new two story structure with front porch per attached plans and specifications. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailing on new historic structures should be compatible with other historic structures in the district. 2. Storyboard, materials samples and window and door specifications and scaled drawings are required for final review. <p>The guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC provide feedback to the applicant.</p>
Applicant(s)	Kevin Kerr, property owner, offers to answer the Commissioners' questions.

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Nutter has concern about four mature trees in the driveway area, and says they are not included in the site plan. Mr. Kerr says there are only two trees on his property, and one is not in good shape. He says his driveway is coming off of Hunter Banks' commercial property, and this is the only location that will not impact their parking spaces. Chair Wampler instructs him to show the trees on his site plan and provide an arborist's opinion if there are any they want to remove.

Commissioner Nutter asks about the slope of the property, and doesn't think it is shown in the renderings. Mr. Kerr says he will show a different perspective that will illustrate this better. He notes the new plan for the structure is further back on the lot than his first proposal.

Commissioner Carpenter says Short Street style is simple construction, and advises the applicant not to make the structure too complicated. He questions the gable design with vent. Mr. Kerr says they will not need a vent there, and the design has changed.

Mr. Kerr says he intends to use four over one aluminum clad windows, and has changed his plan to use cedar shakes over Miratec hardiplank siding. He will use Hooper's Creek stone and pebbledash for the foundation. He says the setback will mirror that of the neighboring house, and the footprint is smaller than his first design, which was for a one story structure.

Commissioner Cook says the foundation materials should be the same all around and the open area under the porch should be enclosed. Mr. Kerr says they will be.

Commissioner Carpenter asks about the roof form over the bay window. Mr. Kerr says they were reflecting the design of 37 Montford. Commissioners compliment the improvements Mr. Kerr has made.

Other Business:

Commissioner Farmer says the Commission should consider making the guidelines the same as the City's in regards to accessory and primary structures, to eliminate confusion. Ms. Merten says she worked with a committee for the past year to come up with the revised guidelines that were just adopted. She admits there are still confusing issues in them.

Chair Wampler asks the Commissioners to review their calendars for the best time for the annual retreat, January or February. Ms. Merten asks them to suggest topics for the retreat, and says density will be one.

Ms. Merten reports the owner of 75 Magnolia installed windows after being denied in a recent review, and has been served with a notice of violation, stop work order, and a \$100 day fine. She says there is no maximum for the fine. She reports there has only been one other similar incident, and in that case a settlement was reached on the fine. Attorney Ashley says a court order would likely be required for further action. Ms. Merten says the property owner mistakenly thought he would only be charged a \$250 fine per window. Atty. Ashley says there are additional fees and penalties for altering historic structures that may apply. She notes the 30 days the applicant had to appeal the HRC's decision has passed, now he has 60 days opportunity to appeal the Notice of Violation. Commissioner Cook recalls the applicant adamantly disagreed with the guidelines during his review.

Commissioner Ross asks for the outcome of the porch rail in dispute on Cherokee Road (Possum Trot II). Ms. Merten says as there have been no complaints, enforcement staff have not proceeded with any action.

Commissioner Nutter moves to adjourn the meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Cothran

Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 6:58 pm.